Interview Summary	10/580,605	ITO, HISAYOSHI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Liam J. Heincer	1796	
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):			
(1) <u>Liam J. Heincer</u> .	(3)		
(2) <u>D Masika</u> .	(4)		
Date of Interview: 24 July 2008.			
Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)□ Video Conference c)□ Personal [copy given to: 1)□ applicant 2)□ applicant's representative]			
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If Yes, brief description:			
Claim(s) discussed: <u>16 and 19-32</u> .			
Identification of prior art discussed: <u>none</u> .			
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.			
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant noted that a mistake in the numbering of the claims in the notice of allowability had been made. The Examiner agreed to issue a supplemental notice of allowability. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.			
_	/Mark Eashoo/ SPE, 1796 Examiner's signature, if requi	red	

Application No.

Applicant(s)